

**IN THE MATTER OF: Master Metals, Inc. Site
Public Meeting**

- - -

**Transcript of Public Meeting, called by
the United States Environmental Protection Agency,
before Denise C. Winter, a Registered Merit Reporter
and Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio
on Thursday, March 18, 1999 at the Pilgrim
Congregational Church, 2592 W. 14th Street, Cleveland,
Ohio.**

- - -

APPEARANCES:

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Bri Bill
Jeff Heath
Gwen Massenburg
Kris Vezner**

**Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Sheila Abraham
Bart Ray**

- - -

**MERIT REPORTING SERVICES
2000 East Ninth Street, Suite 210
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
216-781-7120**

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CIMPERMAN: Good evening. I would like to call this meeting to order, the discussion regarding the Master Metals site and the EPA proposed cleanup. My name is Joe Cimperman. I'm the councilman for Tremont and the area included in the Master Metals site. There's just a few people I want to recognize that are here with us today: Councilwoman Merle Gordon, who is the councilwoman of Ward 15, Commissioner Ross, who is here from the City's Community Development Department as well as Nora McNamara from Community Development. Thank you for coming.

Am I missing any others? The director of our Public Health Department walked in, Director Whitlow. Thanks for coming.

And tonight we're going to be hearing from the EPA about one issue and that issue is the cleanup of the Master Metals site. Just to set the record straight from the beginning, we are not here to talk about reuse of the site. We are not here to talk about who is going to move into that site, if anyone. The discussion tonight is centered completely around the cleanup of this project.

There's a few people presenting tonight. Bri Bill is here as well as Jeff Heath and Gwen Massenburg who are here from the EPA. They are going to be responsible for presenting. I ask that you keep your questions until the end and if there's anything that you would like to talk with me about, I will be around after the meeting.

Without further ado, thank you for coming, and, Bri Bill, thank you.

MS. BILL: Hi and welcome. Can everybody hear me? Would you like me to use the mike?

MR. CIMPERMAN: You're fine.

MS. BILL: My name is Bri Bill. I'm a community involvement coordinator from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency with the Office of Public Affairs. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to talk specifically about the Master Metals site. For those of you who may not be familiar with where it is, it's on Third Street down in the Flats area.

Our main goal tonight is to present EPA's plan for doing a final cleanup on the site -- there's been some interim things over the years. This is our final cleanup -- and also to take your comments and try to answer your questions about what we propose to be doing.

As Joe mentioned, tonight we're talking about Master Metals. We aren't in a position to be able to answer general questions about air quality in the area or to talk about reuse of the site. I would like to introduce a couple of other people. This is Jeff Heath, EPA remedial project manager, Kris Vezner, our staff attorney, Gwen Massenburg who is also a remedial project manager with U.S. EPA. She's been working with Jeff over the last few months on this site. She's going to be taking over in a couple of months. Jeff is moving on to another agency.

Sheila Abraham from Ohio EPA and Bart Ray, also from Ohio EPA. And I just wanted to clarify something, too. Even though we have similar names, Ohio EPA and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, we are not the same agency. Ohio EPA is not an Ohio office of the U.S. EPA. I'm federal. Four of us are federal. Sheila and Bart are State.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the format of tonight's meeting. Most of you have an agenda. We'll start out with the presentation. We'll go over sort of the background of the Master Metals site, talk a little bit about the previous site investigations and then move on to talk about our proposed cleanup plan. We'll then open the floor up to question and answer and we'll do our best to answer your questions tonight. If we can't, we'll just take your name

and get back to you or perhaps refer you to another agency who is more apt to be able to answer your questions.

After the question and answer, we'll move into sort of a formal part of the meeting where we'll have a formal hearing. We will take comments for the record. As many of you noticed, we have a court reporter here tonight and she's transcribing the entire meeting. In about two, three, two or three weeks we'll have a transcript of tonight's meeting. We'll put a copy in the Jefferson Branch library in the Tremont area.

At any rate, when we get to the comment period, what we'd like, if any of you want to make a formal comment during that time, we ask that you fill out one of the gray cards out in the hall and I'll be calling your name sort of in the order in which you filled out the card. At that time once you've made your comment, we won't be responding to comments tonight. Again, we'll try to answer your questions during the question and answer, but during the comment period, we would just like to hear your comment and in a month or so we will be preparing a written response to the comments that pertain to the Master Metals facility.

Finally, I think most of you have signed in. We use the sign-in sheets to update our mailing list so you hear about meetings. It's not distributed to anybody else.

Finally, just a little bit about the comment period. It started on March 1st. It ends on March 31st and we'll be accepting oral comments tonight during the comment period. We'll also accept written comments through March 31st, and in one of your handouts -- this one -- there's a sheet you can write written comments and send them to me, fax them to me, you can send me an E-mail, write something tonight and hand them to us at the meeting, whatever is easiest for you. I guess that's about it.

Does anybody have any questions about the format of tonight's meeting?

THE AUDIENCE: (No response)

MS. BILL: No. Okay. We're going to start out by showing a ten-minute video that describes the Superfund program and Superfunds in the federal program under which this site is being cleaned up, and not all the things in here pertain to this site, but it kind of gives you a general idea of what we're doing.

(Thereupon, a video was presented as follows:)

SPEAKER: Hello. I'm Kenneth Lucas, a project manager for the EPA Superfund program. Years ago people didn't understand how certain chemical wastes would effect people's health and environment. Many wastes were dumped on the ground, into rivers or left out in the open. As a result, thousands of abandoned hazardous waste sites were created. If there's a Superfund site in your neighborhood, you're probably wondering what will happen, how will it be cleaned up, who will pay for the cleanup and what you can do to keep your family's home and community safe.

We produce this video to help you understand the Superfund process from discovery of a site through cleanup and to tell you what you can do to become involved.

There are several steps to the Superfund process: Site discovery, site assessment, early action and long-term action. All of these steps work toward one goal and that is to clean up sites quickly and safely. The number one goal of the Superfund program is to protect human health in the environment. Its mandate is addressed to abandon and control hazardous waste sites.

So how we accomplish that is to first identify these sites, come up with a plan to remediate them and go in and actually, as we say, turn dirt, get in, get the chemicals out and leave it in

a condition that is safe for the surrounding community for the future.

Throughout the process, we involve the community and enforce the law by making the ones responsible for creating the Superfund sites pay to clean them up. The Superfund process begins with site discovery. Potential hazardous waste sites come to EPA's attention through a variety of sources. Sometimes we receive reports from local and state agencies, businesses, the U.S. Coast Guard and many sites are reported by people like you. In fact, EPA encourages public participation in the Superfund process from the very beginning. I would say community involvement is essential to the Superfund cleanup process. Without an informed community, I don't believe that we can have an effective cleanup.

As a Superfund site, the National Response Center has a 24-hour hotline where you can call to report a hazardous waste incident or site. Many of the calls that come in to the hotline are emergencies and require immediate action. Everyone can relate to an emergency action. You're going to have an explosion threat, there could be a fire, there could be a lagoon full of contaminants that because of heavy rains is about to overflow into a pristine river.

If there is an emergency, Superfund will immediately respond to eliminate any risks to the community and to ensure that people and the environment are safe. Whether or not it begins as an emergency site that is reported, EPA must undergo a site assessment to evaluate the possible hazards posed by the site and to determine whether any additional cleanup action is necessary. Site assessment allows us to screen a large number of sites and to prioritize our work so that those sites that pose the worst threat to human health and to the environment are the ones that get cleaned up.

It's at this point in the process we have identified a potential problem and the state and EPA will begin working together. To further characterize the problem, we'll send technical experts to the site to test the soil, water and the air. And to get a better idea of the hazardous wastes that are present at the site, sometimes they will interview nearby residents to compile a history of the site. They use this information to determine how serious the risks may be.

If EPA determines that the site may be a threat to the community or the environment in the near future, the agency will perform what is called an early action at the site. Early action really addresses imminent threats such as surface soil that children could eat. What we would do is go in and remove the source of contamination, get in there quickly and get the risks reduced.

Typically early actions are taken to prevent direct contact with contaminants, remove hazardous materials, prevent contaminants from spreading, provide drinking water, temporarily and permanently evacuate or relocate affected residents, whatever it takes to shorten the time that people are exposed to contamination and to decrease the negative effects of the contaminants to people and the environment.

While EPA is working to remove threats posed by the site and assess the site, the Agency is also seeking out the individuals or companies responsible and these are the potentially responsible parties. What we do is identify the companies or the people responsible for the contamination, then we try to reach an agreement to get them to pay for their fair share of the cleanup work at the site.

Right now the majority of the cleanup work going into Superfund sites is either being performed or being paid for by the responsible parties. If EPA cannot find responsible parties or can't force them to pay for the cleanup, the Agency will pay for the work.

Some sites have extensive contamination problems caused by years of pollution and neglect.

They may take several years, even decades, to clean up. These sites require what are called long-term actions. A long-term action is more than just a surface problem. We may get in and find hundreds of leaking drums buried beneath the surface or we may find that the ground water supply has been contaminated. At other sites we may need to restore the wetlands or other natural resources. But as the name suggests, we're going to be there working for some time to correct the problem.

To gauge the extent of contamination at a site, EPA uses a hazard ranking system. If the site scores high enough, it's placed on the National Priority List which is a published list of hazardous waste sites that are eligible for long-term cleanup action under the Superfund program. Once the site has been placed on the National Priorities List, EPA will perform detailed studies to determine the best option to clean up the contamination.

Our goal is to take the formerly contaminated property and not only make them environmentally safe and safe for the community but to make the land usable again. In doing this, we work closely with the community and the states to come up with an agreed upon use for the property and then design a cleanup that will meet this use. EPA then uses this information to develop and present a proposed plan for long-term cleanup which describes the various cleanup options being considered and identifies the options which EPA will work best with.

This plan is presented to the community and to local and state officials for comment. This information can be highly technical, so EPA provides assistance to communities through the Technical Assistance Grant Program to help them understand the complex information relating to Superfund cleanup. The Technical Assistance Grant Program allows those community groups to hire their own independent technical advisor who takes the technical information and interprets it into a form that community members can understand. EPA also takes into account the needs of minority and low income citizens to make sure that sites in these communities receive equal attention and protection.

We're taking a look at the way that we do business at EPA to make sure that we are making fair decisions, especially in low income and minority communities that are around Superfund sites. We're reaching out to these various communities and empowering them so they can get involved in the cleanup process. Once the public's concerns are addressed, EPA publishes a record of decision which describes how the Agency plans to clean up the site. EPA will then inform the community about the action that will take place at the site.

Now that EPA is ready to begin the actual cleanup of the site, the length of time that it takes to clean up a Superfund site depends a lot on the complexity of the site and the nature of the contaminants that are there. With more complex sites, we may have to do several activities over a period of five or more years and in some of those, particularly where we're cleaning up ground water, we may be there for 20 or 30 years.

To make sure that sites remain safe, EPA routinely monitors sites. If there's any indication of a problem that threatens people or the environment, EPA will take an early option to immediately eliminate the threat and make the site safe again. Everyone wants a clean environment, a safe place to work and to raise our families. EPA understands this and through the Superfund program, we're working to clean up hazardous waste sites and to make the environment safe now and in the future.

(Thereupon, the videotape was concluded.)

MS. BILL: You may have heard a reference to early action. There was an

early action taken at Master Metals which Jeff will be talking about in just a few minutes. We're now into that final cleanup stage.

I'll turn the floor over to Jeff Heath. I would like to ask you, too, if you do have questions, to please try to hold them until after the presentations.

MR. HEATH: I'm going to get by without the microphone. Can you hear me back there? Raise your hand if I get soft or something. There's more seats up front, six more. If somebody wants to grab them, now is a good time.

Okay. Here's the agenda I'm going to cover tonight: I'm going to touch on the history. There's a very complex history on the site. I just want to touch on it, try not to focus on it. Many of you are probably more aware of it than I am. For those of you who aren't, I'm going to touch on that, talk about the early cleanup actions that occurred at the site, and I think both of them happened within the last year, talk about the investigations at the site and around the site, cover the recommended cleanup alternatives that we're proposing that I think most of you have seen as a proposed plan in the information flyer that went out, look at the evaluation criteria we use to select that proposed plan, look at the other cleanup alternatives that we considered and discuss similarities and why we didn't select that one and go into the next steps, where we go from here.

Operational history. That site has been operational since 1933. National Land ran the site up until 1979 when Master Metals took it over and operated it until 1993. They produced lead bars from acid batteries and other materials such as slag and other industrial process material that was waste and brought to the site and the recovered lead from those, that waste that was brought there.

They employed 95 people and produced approximately 15,000 tons of iron a year. The waste product they regenerated were furnace flux, slag, dross and emission control dust, and the one we're really concerned with is emission control dust. That contains about 60 percent lead and it has a tendency to float around and be blown around and it's transportable. It's very transportable. That was a big one we were concerned about. Most of their waste they try to recycle through the furnace to recover any additional lead that was in there and the slag was disposed of off site.

As far as the regulatory history, Occupational Safety and Health Administration became involved in 1986 when they determined that Master Metals' employees were exposed to eight times the permissible level of lead. After multiple violations in 1990, a U.S. district judge ordered the removal of employees from the site that had high blood levels.

Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District became involved in 1980 when they documented that there was lead, cadmium, copper and zinc in the adjacent sewer. Because of these discoveries, Master Metals was ordered to put in a waste water treatment facility on their site.

Ohio EPA became involved with Master Metals in their permitting of the wastes, the waste that was brought to the site. They would have to have a permit to describe how they were going to use it and there were specific procedures for handling that lead waste and Ohio EPA was administering that permit.

In 1986, after Master Metals wasn't responsive to violations, the case was referred to the Department of Justice. During the late '80s, there was continued violations in waste handling on the site and in 1992, Ohio EPA again collected air samples and those air samples contained lead in concentrations which were 25 times higher than acceptable air standards, and in August of that same year, Ohio EPA shut down Master Metals.

U.S. EPA became involved in the legal agreements with Master Metals to improve the waste handling operations which was referred to the U.S. EPA by the Ohio EPA. We set up legal documents to force them to improve their operations. After Master Metals had over a million dollars in fines and they didn't seem to have the capability to correctly close down the site or clean up the site, EPA determined that it qualified for the Superfund program.

So to summarize the 20 years, from 1980, or 19 years, from 1980 up until now, from 1980 to 1986, regulatory agencies documented continued violations at the site. In 1986, it was referred to the U.S. Justice System to start processing legal actions against Master Metals and during that time violations continued to occur.

From 1990 to 1994, there were negotiations on closing down Master Metals and negotiations on cleaning up the site with Master Metals, giving them the opportunity to clean up their own mess. The federal government just doesn't come in and throw them off and take over unless we have good reason to believe they are not capable. During that time is when Master Metals shut down. One of the reasons was the requirement for closure and clean up.

In 1994, it went into the Superfund program and hopefully by 1999, this year, we'll be complete with the site.

As I mentioned, earlier, there were two early actions, interim actions, which were done to provide -- to protect human health and environment. They were critical removal actions to remove the waste that was on site. One of them was at the Holmden area, Holmden Avenue properties and the other one was at the Master Metals site. In June of '93, they took soil samples at Holmden Avenue. Lead levels were approximately 17 times higher than the acceptable cleanup level, acceptable residential cleanup level at that site.

At that time Master Metals removed over a thousand cubic yards of contaminated soil and relocated some of the residents there. U.S. EPA became involved in 1997 when they tested again and found high levels at the site. Those levels were about half the level of what was previously found there, but they also required Master Metals to remove another 1,500 yards of soil which was treated and brought back down to the Master Metals site.

Here is an aerial photo of the site in '97. This is Third Street. Quigley is over here. This is a furnace, melting furnace. I think there's a melting furnace and bag house that sat there, storage facilities, waste bins. Here's the central offices and here's a part of the railroad roundhouse that actually sat on Master Metals' property. The contractor mobilized to the site in April of '97 during that initial mobilization and they set up air monitoring as soon as they got on site.

During that initial mobilization, there were some high air readings, higher levels of lead that were recorded. Immediately they started engineering aials which were misting of the sites and watering down. There had been a lot of dust that was left on the site when PRP left, but throughout the remainder of the cleanup action, there were no more air exceedences at all, just the first few days when they had the trucks and equipment on site.

They decontaminated baghouses, furnaces, roundhouses. What that means is they scraped dust, debris and everything that had collected inside the facilities and pressure washed all the facilities to get this lead dust that has a tendency to float and travel in the air. Then they carefully demolished the buildings and facilities separating the debris, steel and such into piles and took down structures and dug out furnaces and took out basically all the facilities.

They also removed the soil that was between the edge of the concrete and the fence line. They excavated that soil and put down a plastic liner and put some sand on top as a temporary

measure until the action that we're proposing now became underway.

They excavated 4,300 tons of soil. That soil was treated and so it was below hazardous equivalent and it was taken to Illinois and put in a hazardous waste landfill. There they removed a thousand tons of debris, that is metal, brick and concrete, 21 tons of asbestos. That went to a hazardous waste landfill in Ontario. 1,160 tons of lead dust, lots of dust there, that went to a hazardous waste landfill in Ontario.

They removed chromium trioxide which is a chemical used in the melting process. 3,600 yards was burned in New York. 200 bottles of lab chemicals were taken out of that site. That was also burned in New York. There was 3,000 gallons of fuel, oil, soaps, degreasers, acids and bases and that was shipped to be taken care of at the Cleveland -- Chemical Solvents in Cleveland.

So it was a substantial effort, over one million dollars worth of work done in a short period of time in an early action which we felt was justified to protect human health and the environment. The work was completed in January 1998.

Here is a photo of the site from the opposite side just to make sure you're paying attention. Here's Third Street now. It's at the top. Quigley is down here. Here's the offices, the roundhouse. All structures were taken down. You can see the concrete is kind of hodgepoded. Some of it had been there since the beginning of the operation. Some of it was installed later. It's cracked, it's degraded. Some areas, it's just rubble.

Cleanup Investigations. Air sampling started in the 1980s and back then they recorded lead levels in the air that were approximately four times the national air quality standards. In 1986, those lead levels had increased to eight times the national air quality standards and in 1992, before the shutdown of Master Metals, the lead levels were twenty times greater than the national air quality standards. Things got worse over time.

Soil samples that were taken on the property of Master Metals within the fence line showed that the contamination in the soil next to the concrete and the soil that was under the concrete was approximately the equivalent which was 35 to 40 times an acceptable cleanup level at the site. So, in other words, what's underneath that concrete is pretty much the same concentration of what's along the edges of the concrete. We feel that is because, over the years, they may have put in more slabs and foundation as they went, just kind of covered it up as they went.

We also found that there's -- the site is built on slag. That was customary. Most of that whole valley is filled in with slag which also has some type of lead content to it, also, so we can't really justify that everything under the concrete was attributable to Master Metals. Some of it is from the slag that was existing there before they started their operation. That's just some background information.

Sampling that was taken off the property, we went in in 1993 and went to the residential neighborhoods to see how far, if and how far, some of this lead had spread into the neighborhoods. We found that we had slightly elevated levels of lead that were above the residential standards. It would have been okay in an industrial setting, but they were slightly above residential standards.

Immediately we went back and, well, it was tied in to Master Metals. The way we do that is to do testing between the residential neighborhoods and Master Metals. We tested along Quigley Avenue there and we discovered that the levels of lead along Quigley Avenue met the acceptable standards, so what we figured is that the slightly elevated levels that were in the

residential neighborhoods were because of the industrial valley as a whole, the possible lead paint that was in the older homes in the area and also the closeness to the expressway, but we could not tie that directly to the Master Metals' site.

We also did sampling that was outside the fence line which is the area that we're addressing in the next project. From the fence line out to the sidewalk, this pretty much matched up with everything we found inside the fence line, approximately 40 times the acceptable cleanup level.

We did ground water sampling that showed concentrations of lead and chromium in the ground water.

Here's a photo of the site as it exists now. You can see the concrete is pretty broken up. There's weeds growing through there, different elevations from foundations of buildings. So now that we had all this data on what was going on, where the lead was and what was above an acceptable level for EPA, we developed different alternatives to protect humans and the environment from those contaminants. Once we had different alternatives, we evaluated those along with -- against certain criteria and came up with the recommended alternative.

So instead of reviewing all the different alternatives we went through, first I'll review the recommended alternative in detail and then talk about how the other alternatives relate to that. They're all pretty similar, you'll see.

Recommended alternative includes excavating the contaminated soil between fence line and the roadway. That's digging up the soil. Here's Third Street. Quigley is over here. Here's the fence line to the south. This area along the eastern portion, there's a small strip maybe two or three feet wide, then there's an area here next to the roundhouse. That's the area we're talking about possibly digging down two to three feet, taking out that soil and replacing it with clean soil so that there's no exposure to anybody that would be walking by, and it will be cleaned up to a level that's acceptable for industrial use.

Next we would consolidate the soil on the site which is bring that inside the fence line and place it on the deteriorated concrete. This hatched area shows where it will be located, approximately. We anticipate that to be maybe a couple inches thick. We don't have true quantities right now because that will depend on how deep the contamination goes off site. It will also be used to fill holes and attempt to level the site. There's big, I guess you could say, potholes that they chiseled out taking out the furnaces. Some of them went below grade.

THE AUDIENCE: Using the contaminated soil for that purpose?

MR. HEATH: Yeah.

We cover that contaminated soil with a heavy plastic liner, 18 inches of clay and soil on top of that. There were some pamphlets that went out that show this a little better. There's a section up here. Contaminated soil that exists under the concrete is here. You have your concrete that sits here. We will layer the contaminated soil. There will be a plastic liner placed over that to keep the contaminated soil from migrating with the clay and also provide somewhat of a moisture barrier.

The clay, 18 inches of clay, is specifically used to keep water from seeping down into the contaminated soil, then 6 inches of topsoil which is to protect the clay and provide vegetation. There will be deed restrictions on the site; that is, restrictions on how it will be used. The deed restrictions will not allow the penetration of that clay cap or penetrating down into the contaminated soil. It will also restrict putting in of ground water wells to extract ground water in that site.

And, finally, there will be an extensive maintenance program that will go on for 30 years. There will be inspections of the site regularly, maintenance that's required, any repairs will be done and the site will be fenced in so that there will be continuous care of that cap and it will be monitored. Every 5 years EPA will go back and do an evaluation of the site, collect more data on lead in the area to ensure that the cap is still doing what it's supposed to do, and if we find out that it's not working as it should be, we always reserve the right to go back to the responsible parties for additional action that may be required.

We don't foresee that right now. This is a proven technology. This is used all over the nation right now, but there always is that option to go back.

Okay. The evaluation criteria we use is three things: The effectiveness of the alternative, that is the effectiveness of eliminating the potential exposure to contaminants on the site. What we're trying to do is limit the exposure to humans and the environment and the method we're doing that here is by capping it, covering it, putting fences, deed restrictions to keep people from digging into it.

Implementability. That's how easy is it to implement both technically or from the engineering point of view and does it also meet administrative regulations, state standards, EPA federal regulations, laws.

And then costs. We all understand that.

Here are the alternatives we looked at. We always look at the do nothing alternative. It's just another, look, do we really need to do something at this site. Do we -- is there still a risk out there at this site if someone were to go out there and start digging along the fence line. There's a risk of digging up that soil and ingesting it. That's why we're removing it and bringing it on site and fencing it and covering it.

There's also a risk that somebody could possibly want to build on the site in the future and start ripping up concrete and we know there's contaminated soil under that concrete. So the do nothing alternative, although there's no costs, there's still some risk involved.

Alternative 2 is the one I just explained. That's the recommended alternative. Excavation, consolidation with a clay cover. We're talking about a price there of \$530,000, just to get an idea of where these are at.

Alternative 3 is very similar to alternative 2. We excavate the soil that is outside the fence line, bring it on site, pull it on top of your deteriorated concrete, but this time we put an asphalt cap on top of it, four inches of asphalt. It provides a little bit -- it's a little bit more useful than grass growing. There's an additional cost of a little over \$300,000 to do that. There are some additional maintenance costs also with that, repairing cracks, things like that.

Alternative 4 is also similar. We excavate the soil from off site. This time we treat it, though, treat it down to a level where it's not hazardous, truck it off site and dispose of it in a disposal facility. We still need to put the asphalt cap on because the concrete that sits above that sits on the ground. Now, it's not a legitimate cap or a strong enough cap to protect anybody from getting to the contaminated soil that's underneath it. They're talking \$980,000 there, so the price goes up.

So using those three alternatives, the one we're recommending is alternative 2.

With that, we move on to the next steps, and since Gwen will be taking over this project for me within the next month or two, she's going to go through the next phases from here. Thanks for your time.

MS. MASSENBURG: I'm Gwen Massenburg.

Basically the next steps, these first four steps are what we call administrative steps, and what I would like to do is just say one sentence, give you a brief overview of what these steps are based on.

This is the comment period here, and so what we're going to do is review the comments, and remember that March 31st deadline. If you plan on sending your comments in and after we get those comments, we're going to review them and based on the comments received, the select remedy proposed here tonight will either remain the same or it will be altered.

The action memorandum is what we like to call the action memo, and basically this action memo is a document that is reviewed and approved by the director of Superfund. The action memo also gives the notification, the justification for EPA taking action and having the site cleaned up. The consent order is a legal negotiated document and basically it's a document that binds the PRP to perform U.S. EPA's selected plan at the site.

THE AUDIENCE: What is a PRP?

MS. MASSENBURG: It's a potentially responsible party. Thank you.

The next step is the design phase. The design phase is an engineering phase. It's a phase where the technical drawings and specifications are laid out based on the remedy selected. And the last and final phase is the construction phase, and in our office we like to call it the removal action and it's just the actual cleanup of the site. Thank you.

MS. BILL: I would like to open the floor up to questions. Again, just a reminder that we do have a court reporter here and before you ask a question, if you could just state your first and last name. If your name has an unusual spelling or is difficult, if you could spell it for us.

Questions.

MS. OGAWA: Yeah I wanted to -- Pauline Ogawa, O-G-A-W-A, and I wanted to know, okay, I'm asking the question, when Jeff was talking about taking the soil from the perimeter of the contaminated soil and filling the potholes and cracks in the concrete above, I guess, one, doesn't that defeat the purpose of removing three to four feet of soil and replacing it with clean soil and then you're filling the cracks? Maybe I don't understand that.

MR. HEATH: We're taking the soil that's outside the fence line that's not protected from human contact right now and putting in on site in a fenced in area and covering it with approximately a two-foot cap.

MS. OGAWA: It will be covered?

MR. HEATH: It will be covered. I'm sorry. I wasn't clear on that. If I would have had a better, like, section, as we call it, a cut through it, you would have seen, but that will be put on top of the concrete and there will be two foot of material on top of it. They will have deed restrictions which will legally prevent anybody from digging through to that.

MS. OGAWA: And on that same line, that plastic barrier that is underneath there, it's only 18 or 20 inches below. There's a lot of weeds that grow tall. If a tree grows on there, won't the roots break that barrier, and what will happen?

MR. HEATH: There will be restrictions on what can grow there. If you see in a landfill, most landfills they don't let trees grow. Maybe small shrubs. They don't have the exact type of caps. There will be limits on what can grow.

MS. OGAWA: So someone removes those?

MR. HEATH: That will be part of the -- someone is going to have to mow that thing, eradicate any weeds, like you say, that have long roots. It's a technology that has been

used for years in closing landfills and they know what the root depths are and they watch that.

MS. BILL: Okay.

MS. FAGAN: Kathleen Fagan. I have a question of the early action. You said that soil was removed and treated and brought back. How do you actually treat that soil? Where did you put it?

MR. HEATH: The soil that was removed early, I think it was in '93, the state was more involved with it at that time. Sheila can answer that. I don't know where it went.

MS. ABRAHAM: I guess I wasn't involved personally, but just to ask you to clarify, are you talking about the soil from the Holmden Avenue property, or are you talking about any actions of Master Metals?

MS. FAGAN: I think the Holmden Avenue property. I don't know if you did it at Master Metals.

MS. ABRAHAM: I don't believe it was done at Master Metals. At Holmden, these were three separate actions taken by Mr. Mickey, who kind of took responsibility for that, and part of it was paid by him, part of it is paid by people who are responsible for taking the soil there.

And our understanding was that it was sent off site to other places. We were never able to get clear answers because we continued to correspond with him, and I have everything in the files and you can -- I can talk to you after. I can show you exactly what he said, but we believe that that was not taken back to Master Metals. It was taken elsewhere. That's what we were told. It was disposed of appropriately.

MS. LIPOVAN: My name is Emily Lipovan, L-I-P-O-V-A-N. I'm representing the Tremont West Development Corporation. I have several questions.

What is the current status of the Holmden Hill, Holmden Avenue site?

MR. HEATH: The site is cleaned up to residential standards, the contaminated soil has been removed and has been backfilled with clean soil.

MS. LIPOVAN: And the homes where families were evacuated, the homes are still being left as is?

MS. ABRAHAM: There is no structure on site. The site is --

MS. LIPOVAN: Behind the houses.

MR. HEATH: There was one property where there was a house. It curves around behind the yards of a few other residents, but there's no further action to be done at the Holmden Avenue site.

MS. LIPOVAN: So it's been validated that that soil is up to residential standards?

MR. HEATH: Yes.

MS. LIPOVAN: So none of the residents on Holmden Hill, Holmden Avenue should have any concerns regarding leftover contamination from Master Metals?

MR. HEATH: No.

MS. LIPOVAN: A second question that I have is during Jeff's presentation, some entities made a determination of the potential use of Master Metals' site between West 3rd and Quigley and that determination led to -- like continued the thought process of how to remediate.

MR. HEATH: Right.

MS. LIPOVAN: What entity decided that? And the reason why I ask that

question is, just to give some history, I attended a 9:30 meeting this morning where I got a lot of education, so this is from 9:30 until today, so I have to apologize.

With the cap, it prohibits footers to be put into the soil for any real -- I don't want to say real large industrial development or building. So the concern that I have is the industrial use that is being proposed is a limited industrial use. So I go back to the question of what entity decided, determined, the use?

MR. HEATH: I guess it was EPA in coordination with Ohio EPA and responsible parties. There's basically industrial standards and residential standards, so it wasn't going to be a residential area, so it was industrial. But you're right when you are saying it's limited industrial use with that cap, but it does allow for industrial use of the site.

MS. LIPOVAN: I'll be more specific. Light industrial or heavy?

MR. HEATH: We don't differentiate.

MS. ABRAHAM: It doesn't make a difference. The cleanup level is protective of either.

MS. LIPOVAN: But the cap does -- there is an understanding -- am I understanding this correctly that this cap that separates the contaminated soil, this plastic layer, if that's the recommended remediation, it prohibits a footer? If I wanted to, if I bought Master Metals, I couldn't build a tall building?

MR. HEATH: It's not impossible, but because of the deed restrictions, it would be nearly impossible. That's why they are there, to make sure that doesn't happen. There would have to be a legal change in the deed restriction which takes a lot of legal effort. There would have to be a plan presented which would have to be approved by EPA and monitored closely.

But to understand, the cap isn't going to cover the total site.

MS. LIPOVAN: It's just that --

MR. HEATH: Mostly in the deteriorated areas and the concrete. There are areas where you can quick-fill the foundations and footers, although you are correct, it is limited. I can't disagree with that.

MS. LIPOVAN: Does the EPA provide technical assistance to future users to work with the limitations that are being posed by this remediation?

MR. HEATH: Right now or in the future once the cap is on?

MS. LIPOVAN: Well, I'm assuming that the cap is the remediation that is accepted.

MS. ABRAHAM: When we talk about the industrial use, the problem at Master Metals is that if we try to clean the site up to the thousand -- up to the lead standard of a thousand pounds per million, there is no way to achieve that, because as you go down, the site is built on slag.

So because it's impossible to achieve that standard, realistically we're forced to put the cap on and prevent exposure by the industrial worker to this contaminated soil and slag below that. So it's really a function of what is at the site that is driving the remediation. Typically when we have industrial standard remediation to a certain level, that right should be available for all types of reuse. The situation of Master Metals is unique and may not be that unique in the context of the Cleveland area. This is something that you might come across again and again.

MS. LIPOVAN: I'm going to summarize so I'm understanding. So even if

Tremont West won the lottery and we wanted to be able to clean out all the contaminated soil per the diagram that is in the pamphlet and go all the way to the slag, even if we hit the slag, that's still technically contaminated, so I would have to go underneath the slag. You have no idea how deep that is?

MS. ABRAHAM: The slag starts at about two or three feet, and slag contains high lead levels based on soil samples we have seen.

MS. LIPOVAN: And that was in a phase 1?

MS. ABRAHAM: Right. That was in a phase 1. That's where our data comes from.

MS. BILL: Are you asking if everything down to the slag or including the slag was removed, would you be able to put a building there?

MS. ABRAHAM: I think the question is hypothetical because --

MS. LIPOVAN: It's two issues. One issue, because Tremont West has two hats, one is development and the other is accountability to residents. And the concern that has been raised to me by my board and block clubs is that the dirt -- how do we get rid of the dirt. There's a real concern about getting the dirt out, and this cap is not sufficient enough due to its proximity to the CMHA Valley View Estates, Tremont play field, and there needs to be some type of education or reassurance of how that cap makes it okay.

MS. ABRAHAM: I think the thing to understand is that the main effect on the residents would be from the lead dust, and that aspect of the lead contamination and putting the cap on, what you really do is prevent that exposure, so that's how we're hoping that you can explain that.

MS. LIPOVAN: Thank you.

MS. BILL: Kevin.

MR. SCHMOTZER: Kevin Schmotzer, S-C-H-M-O-T-Z-E-R. I want you to maybe explain with the three different ways, the different risks involved. We talked about, a little bit about, the costs involved and different ways as far as the remediation, but, of course, with the cleanup of any of the ways, it's going to help the area and the residents.

But can you discuss any risks possibly, maybe, if there is, that there might be with one alternative that may lessen it with another alternative, or are the risks all the same, or if you can comment about that?

And I also have a second question after that.

MS. BILL: So your question is what is the difference in risk to human health with the different alternatives? Is that what you're asking?

MR. SCHMOTZER: Correct. With the three or four different proposals.

MR. HEATH: Okay. The alternative 2, that's the selected one, and then the risk there is that for some reason the cap may get a crack in it or fail, but it's not going to be like there's a liquid that is going to ooze across the street. They would repair the cap. Nothing is going to come out. All it might do is allow some water to get down to the contaminated material which may cause that water to pick up a little bit of lead particles maybe and then work its way through the concrete, through the rest of the contaminated soil that is already contaminated and that effect isn't really anything different than what's there already. Okay?

The next plan is the asphalt. Asphalt sounds like a better barrier to most people. In this climate, it has a tendency to crack which can be taken care of. There's a lot of maintenance involved. You have to watch the cracks. It's going to have to be resealed periodically, repaved

periodically.

Then we have the fourth alternative which is treating it and taking it off site. That probably is a less amount of risk because of that, because you're taking it off site. The amount of risk is very minimal when you consider what is already there under the cap right now, under the concrete, and there's always a point of diminishing returns. EPA would like to keep up every site where it's crystal clean, but there's a point where the amount of effort and money you spend is not going to reduce the risk so much or enough or any more. That's why EPA has its standards that they usually try to meet, acceptable levels, so that's why we're selecting alternative number 2.

We feel alternative 4, although you are reducing the risk, I have to say you are reducing the risk somewhat, but the amount you're reducing it is very minimal considering you're almost doubling the cost of the project, and legally we have no authority to require that level of cleanup. That's what it comes right down to.

MS. ABRAHAM: Just to follow up, from a practical resident's -- from a Tremont neighborhood point of view, I think I would say that risk is the same between 2, 3 and 4 because you have the two feet, legally two feet, of fill and some kind of property-maintained asphalt in place, so ultimately except for a very small change in numbers, the risk would be the same.

MR. SCHMOTZER: And my second question is kind of an extension off of Emily, what she was talking about. Any of those proposals -- now, if there was some interest in future economic developments, would any of those proposals lead more toward possibly reuse of the land versus just a fenced-off part that basically nobody could walk on or use for 30 years and beyond? Would the asphalt possibly make it more feasible working with the deed restrictions as far as possibly allowing for some type of economic development or reuse again for that property for an industrial use?

MR. HEATH: I guess what's your question? Can you summarize your question?

MR. SCHMOTZER: It sounds like the second proposal, the alternative with the clay with the plastic barrier with the clay and six inches of clean soil that would go on top of that, it sounds like that would not allow for any other future type of possible development because of the increased risk if you are going to put a footer. But if there was an asphalt on top of that, would that possibly make it -- allow it to be easier for any type of economic development for an industrial use, if allowed?

MR. HEATH: Yeah. You're right. It probably would allow for a more beneficial industrial use and that alternative can always be addressed, or we can change that alternative if we get agreements in hand and parties that step up, the interested parties, and we can discuss who's going to pay for that additional cost and work.

EPA always likes to -- we don't like to leave sites vacant. That's why we have the Brownfields Program that is set up to take sites that are set up out there and make them useful again. So if we can get the right people together at a table and discuss the benefits to everybody and figure out how to cost share that additional cost, that's always a possibility. That's the phase we're in now, public comments, and if that was brought to the table and EPA felt comfortable that we could put asphalt down there and still provide protection to human health and the environment, it could be changed to that.

MR. SCHMOTZER: Those are the only questions about the risk and economic

development that I have today. Thank you.

MS. BILL: Just to clarify, the awkward part about Superfund, we are required to look at effectiveness and implementability and to ensure a certain level of protectiveness for human health and environment, and once that is met, we look at cost. But, unfortunately, the Superfund law was not written to look at future use, so it's awkward for us.

We can't just leave a site sitting there open to the environment waiting for a future user to come in. We need to try to get it to a level where human health and environment is protected, but to the extent there is a future user that buys the property and says, we're in, we would like to work with them and hopefully there would be some way for that user or the responsible parties to pay for any additional costs to making that site usable.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells. It's hyphenated. I have three questions. Just, first, a clarification. You said that the off-site contamination is going to be removed down to 1,000 parts per million onto the original slag. Do you know what the contamination level is of the original slag? Will you hit a thousand parts per million or will you not hit a thousand parts per million?

MS. ABRAHAM: The slag is heterogeneous. We do find dirt levels, so it really depends where you test. It's like playing the lotto. You know, you might get a hot spot, you might not. So it's a really hard question to answer. Some of the levels in slag are pretty high.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: So what will the contamination level around the outside be after it's over?

MS. ABRAHAM: Where you have contact with it, where the industrial worker passerby would have contact with it, background, 28, 9, really low.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: That will be tested by random samples taken from around the perimeter.

MS. ABRAHAM: That will be part of the detailed plan. We will check the residual contamination, what is left, and try to make sure.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: In terms of maintenance, am I correct in assuming there will be no change in the contamination level over the 30-year period? It will be just as contaminated after 30 years as it is now; right?

MS. ABRAHAM: We don't have really good data. We have no data on tracking long-time contamination, so as a scientist, I hesitate to say that. 30 years from now, ask me the same question and I will be able to tell you, but I'm being honest with you.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: I understand. So what's the plan for after 30 years?

MS. ABRAHAM: Good question. I think Jeff and Bri can answer that better than I can. The Superfund law requires 30 years maintenance and beyond that we don't have very many sites.

MR. HEATH: We discussed this earlier. It came up this morning and the law says 30 years of maintenance. There's never been a Superfund site that has been closed for 30 years.

What happens on what we call the remedial side of the house, which is the long-term actions, as soon as EPA is done cleaning up the site, we hand it over to the state to do the maintenance, so although I can't promise you this is what's going to happen, in 30 years what's going to happen, look at precedence.

On the other side of the house is where we would reach an agreement with the state or the

city, or hopefully by then someone is using the site. To maintain, we would continue probably to do inspections and monitor the site, but we wouldn't just walk away. First off, the state wouldn't allow that and the city wouldn't allow the state to walk away.

MS. ABRAHAM: If you have concerns, this is a really good opportunity to talk to your legislators and get them involved in what happens.

MS. BILL: Superfund is being reauthorized right now.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: In terms of the maintenance, who is going to be responsible for the inspections, the reporting, if there's no party on that site?

MS. ABRAHAM: The agencies are.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: And then so you will send folks out to do this?

MS. ABRAHAM: We do that at other sites. We do our service and do that and do the reports as necessary. One of them deals with the monitoring issue.

MR. CIMPERMAN: If you monitor it over the period of 30 years, is there some means of communicating to the community, like will you post that at the library? How will we know the grade that the land is getting as you go over that over a 30-year period? That's my first question.

MS. BILL: Written into the regulation, it requires what we call a five-year review and generally what we do at the five-year review is we put an ad in the local paper. We might send out something to the mailing list, send the five-year review to the information repository. If there's something significant found in between those five-year reviews, we might have contact with the community on those, as well.

MR. CIMPERMAN: So how often does that monitoring occur, Bri? Do you go out there monthly, bi-annually? How often are you checking that site to ensure that the contamination isn't continuing?

MR. HEATH: That would be negotiated with the legal document for the final cleanup. I have a couple landfill projects in Wisconsin. Monthly I get reports on what is happening. I get yearly reviews. Every five years I get a report about this saying that they claim everything is perfect.

And EPA does their own review and we compare them. We find out whether there are areas where it's weak and we don't have the data to prove it and we ask the responsible parties to do additional work wherever it's needed. That's how it works there, so it will be negotiated.

MS. ABRAHAM: It's always a two-way street. If you see problems, then you're certainly free to call either of the agencies and report what you see and we will try to address it to the best of our ability.

MR. CIMPERMAN: That comes to my final question. The scenario called the dooms day scenario, that if we cap it and seal it and everything seems to be okay, what happens if that seal is broken, first of all? In this case where, I mean, it's already been a site of illegal dumping, illegal land use, who is to say that, you know, that nobody -- there's no cameras on that site.

I guess my concern is what happens if that sealant is broken? How long is it until you guys know and then you can come and remediate that?

MS. ABRAHAM: Are you asking for monthly inspections?

MR. CIMPERMAN: Yes.

MS. ABRAHAM: Then that's certainly something --

MR. CIMPERMAN: And reports to the block clubs that are around there

monthly. People will be more than willing to give you their addresses. Just understanding that, you know, this process, which we're grateful for in terms of cleaning up, it's come after a long time, but now that, you know, the interest has been raised, there's concern on my part with the ongoing remediation of this project.

MR. QUAYLE: There's neighbors right next door that monitor it on a daily basis right next door to the fence.

MR. CIPHERMAN: Are you monitoring on a daily basis, sir?

MR. QUAYLE: We do.

MR. CIPHERMAN: I would like to put it out to the EPA, if you would do that monthly, that would be great.

MS. BILL: Spell your name.

MR. CIPHERMAN: C-I-M-P-E-R-M-A-N.

MR. GELFAND: My name is Marty Gelfand and I'm here representing Congressman Kucinich.

First off, one of the panelists mentioned let your legislator know if you have some concerns. I want to invite that kind of participation to our office. I also want to know what the concerns are about things like this, and as a legislator, Mr. Kucinich is going to be involved with the reauthorization, if that's happening this year, so please let us know.

I have some cards with me. I don't have enough for everybody in the room, but if you want one, I will give you my card. You can send us any comments that you might have.

The second question I have, or the first question -- that was a statement. The first question I have has to do with potentially responsible parties. You mentioned Master Metals. You mentioned National Lead. Are there others? And the second part of that question is, once the EPA gets involved, does it have any kind of liability for the site after it's completed?

MS. BILL: Would you mind spelling your last name?

MR. GELFAND: G-E-L-F-A-N-D. And Kucinich is K-U-C-I-N-I-C-H.

MR. VEZNER: Yeah. We have around 120 corporations that we have made determinations are liable for cleanup at the site. Now, that's not the same as the court making a determination, but it usually carries some weight with the people we make that determination of as far as their own liability.

I'm not sure about the liability of the federal government. Whatever the federal government's base underlying liability is for doing a Superfund cleanup, even at the site, that is going to vary depending on what type of work you're talking about as far as the time available, and at this time we have completed part of the consent order that we negotiate with the PRPs. I believe they indemnify us for liability, although I'm not certain of that, so that would -- it could. It might. Depends on what kind of agreement we reach with parties at any given site.

I actually don't know what our underlying liability is for the cleanup. It's a little dicey.

MR. GELFAND: Would you be able to follow up on that?

THE COURT: Sure. Of course.

MS. SMITH: Carol Smith, City of Cleveland Lead Program. And one of the questions I have is, do you have any data from other Superfund sites that have been remediated as far as maintenance costs go? What kind of maintenance has been maintained and the cost incurred in that, if we know anything off the top of our heads?

And the other question is, wouldn't you think -- why should somebody inherit, you know,

this mess of a problem? Why don't we clean out as much of it as we can? If we have to leave the slag, then we do. Just clean the whole mess out of there and fill it in with the dirt. It sounds to me like we want to build up. Are we building up this site with more? We're mounding it in a sense.

MS. BILL: Yes.

MR. HEATH: It will be a few inches thick, the contamination, but the cap will be two feet.

MS. SMITH: We're adding two feet. It seems to me to get the best bang for the buck and what's more cost effective, who is going to take care of it? Is somebody going to have to put together something with the City of Cleveland, a program, to come and cut this lot? Are we leaving a dead site for somebody that will never be able to use it?

MR. HEATH: Let me address that. You were asking about maintenance costs?

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. HEATH: I do have a maintenance cost for each one of those alternatives, I think. I don't have them off the top of my head. I have them with me. I can give you those. The City will not be responsible for those maintenance costs. The responsible parties who are paying for the cleanup will be responsible for those costs.

MS. SMITH: Who is that; do we know?

MR. HEATH: There is a group right now of 52 or 53 which paid for the early action. We have to go back and negotiate again with the 120 or so and see, invite them to participate and pay up front, and once that's done, they don't run the risk of being pulled into court later on, so they make the decision, do you want to be a party that participates and pays up front or do you want to go to court later on and have the potential of losing big time.

MS. ABRAHAM: To answer your question on the maintenance costs --

MS. SMITH: I would really like to know if we're looking at alternate number 2, \$544,000?

MR. HEATH: That includes maintenance.

MS. ABRAHAM: The maintenance cost is about 10,000.

MS. SMITH: That wasn't included. That didn't say it included maintenance.

MR. HEATH: Each of those costs included maintenance that I gave you.

MS. ABRAHAM: The maintenance is estimated at this point to be 9,600 for the 30 years.

MR. HEATH: The cost for the asphalt I think is 133,000 for maintenance for 30 years, so that's the big difference. There is a substantial cost for putting that asphalt in.

MS. SMITH: My other question is -- okay. That did answer my question. But I guess when this was all going on, was there any notification of any kind given to the neighborhood to know there was a cleanup occurring or going on and is there going to be one in the future to the residents in the neighborhood to know that this cleanup is going on, because if they see this poof of cloud of smoke or dirt or whatever, that they can call somebody and be aware that's going on and why they see it and they know that they can call somebody?

MS. BILL: I will try to answer that. Oftentimes in the early actions, the emergency response, the goal is just to get in there and get it out, so there probably was not any notification. I wasn't on the site at that time.

But in terms of this next phase, we will continue to mail out fact sheets. We may have a public meeting or open house, send out press releases, that sort of thing.

I don't believe we got to your second question which was would it be better to get all the stuff out rather than leave it there.

MS. SMITH: I understand cost is an issue here. Cost is an issue all the time for these kinds of things. We've had, you know, we have had Master Metals that has been grossly contaminating this entire neighborhood for years and years and including the other industries. Do we know that what they have done hasn't already influenced or put a lot of burden in our own water system and that it's going to continue to do that? Do we know that?

MS. ABRAHAM: Your water system comes from -- the water system, and I guess this is where the City of Cleveland should probably answer, your water comes from Lake Erie and we don't believe that --

MS. SMITH: What about run-off when it storms and rains? Ground water flows to everybody. Water is very tenacious. It will find its way to all kinds of places.

MS. ABRAHAM: The ground water data that you looked at while we have been involved with the site does not show that there it is reaching ground water. In fact, over the years, the levels have gone down and they're reaching non-detectable levels from ground water standpoint. There is run-off, but it's an industrialized area. There is also run-off from a lot of other cities.

MS. SMITH: Is that data available?

MS. ABRAHAM: Yes, ma'am. Yes.

Library.

MS. BILL: Is it in the engineering report?

MS. ABRAHAM: Yes; it is at the library.

MS. SMITH: Thank you very much.

MR. GRULICH: William Grulich, G-R-U-L-I-C-H, and I have two questions. One is, how many other sites are there in the City of Cleveland?

MR. HEATH: Superfund sites?

MR. GRULICH: Yes.

MR. HEATH: I was asked that question early last week. I haven't had a chance to respond to that or pull the data. I have been caught up preparing for this.

MR. GRULICH: So you really don't have any idea?

MS. BILL: Is there anybody from the toxic sweep task force, toxic sweep task force?

THE AUDIENCE: I'm from the task force, but I don't have that information with me.

MR. GRULICH: My follow-up question to that is --

MR. RAY: I'm with the Ohio EPA and I can tell you that the state historically has put together what the state called a master sites list. It's a list of potentially contaminated sites throughout the state of Ohio. We have got approximately 400 sites listed in Cuyahoga County alone on that list. There's approximately another thousand sites that are current facilities that if they go out of business could be added to that list.

Now, the whole legal status of that list is a question mark in the state right now, but a statewide list is in the tens of thousands of sites now, and all those sites -- that doesn't mean

all the sites are contaminated. That just means there was something that happened in the history of that location that put a question mark on that property that says there's a possibility that something could be a problem there.

As far as active cleanup sites in the City of Cleveland alone, through the state's voluntary action program, through the state's remediation program and also U.S. EPA remediation program, it's only an estimate but probably put that in the dozen category, anywhere from two dozen to four dozen sites going on in the city of Cleveland alone.

MR. GRULICH: My follow-up question would be, in this neighborhood, why wouldn't the asphalt be the best alternative as opposed to the second one on the list?

MR. RAY: Jeff may be better able to answer that. My response would be these negotiations for this alternative remedy are with the potential responsible parties and, you know, to be quite frank, the potential responsible parties probably don't care what the future use of that property is. They're looking at a cost estimate and we want to protect the site, so we have a protective remedy that has a lower cost to it that these potential responsible parties are apt to accept, and so that may not lend to a future use. We can't tell those potential responsible parties, well, we want to do this because of future use when they have no real advantage in that, so we're still being protective as something that they can accept.

MR. GRULICH: So it's just let bygones be bygones?

MR. RAY: No. It's a protective remedy that keeps the cost down for the responsible parties. I mean, granted everybody sitting up here would love to tell these responsible parties, go in, take every molecule of lead away from that site and put some clean soil down and make that a usable property for a thousand years to come. That's just not practical and so we come up with a protective remedy that both sides come to an agreement on.

MS. BILL: Does that answer your question?

MR. GRULICH: It sort of answers my question. I would like to know how many of the sites in the city of Cleveland have asphalt on them?

MR. HEATH: Sir, if I can get your name, I can get back to you early next week.

MR. GRULICH: That would be great.

MS. BILL: Most of us here have Master Metals, but we don't deal with the other sites.

MS. BAKER: Deb Baker. I live in this area. I realize that your focus is on the site itself. I live over on Rowley between 11th and 12th. What I want to know, is my soil safe for growing plants? I mean, you know, is it safe to have a vegetable garden, or am I going to poison my family?

MS. BILL: Is there someone from Cleveland Health who might be able to address that question?

MR. GREENBERG: My name is Stu Greenberg. I'm with Environmental Health Watch. I can send you some information -- I will give you my number -- about what soil levels are related -- what lead levels in soil are related to, concerns about growing vegetables. In general, the concern is not so much the uptake of the lead into the plant but it's while working with the soil itself, tracking it into the house or having kids play with it, getting it on their hands. But it depends on how much lead is in the soil. I can -- for that you would have to have soil testing. Now, the Cooperative Extension Service, for a fairly small fee, I think, will

test soil for lead, but I can give you my number if you want.

MS. BILL: As I said before the meeting, I'll give your name to the Ohio Health Department and have them give you a call about that question.

MS. GORDON: Merle Gordon. I have a question regarding your alternatives. It seems to me alternative number 4 is obviously a choice I think that I'm hearing a lot of the people have here, just because we know that we're taking the contaminated soil away. I sort of have a personal feeling about that and fear wherever it's going, and God help the people that live near that facility, but I have a question about, you don't have a number 5 which is a treatment disposal off site and a clay top or a grass top on top of that. Why isn't that an alternative?

And my other comment on your \$10,000 maintenance cost for 30 years seems exorbitantly low. I can't believe that that's all it would cost to maintain this site for the next 30 years, and I would have great fears if that's all you have budgeted in for that, but I would like you to respond why we don't have an alternative number 5 where it would be a grass cap but the soil would have been remediated.

MR. HEATH: Why we don't have an alternative number 5 is because it's so similar to alternative number 2. There's nothing that says that we can't consider that, if there's public comment. That an approach we can look at and cost that out. There's really -- I guess you would have to look at the benefits of that. It's kind of a mix of the two.

MS. GORDON: Mix of the two? You are making a drastic alteration.

MR. HEATH: It would be an alternative 4 and alternative 3. You would be taking it off site and then putting -- no. It would be alternative 2 and alternative 4, but we can look at that.

MS. GORDON: Are you going on regulations that are based on Superfund or EPA guidelines from a certain year and should we expect that regulations on Superfund sites will be changing in the next ten years and will you have to adapt to that and come back to the sites and make any alterations?

MS. BILL: I believe the last change in the law was 1986 and that's what we're going with now. There may be regulations -- that's when the law was reauthorized. There may have been new regulations since then. I would assume that if Superfund is reauthorized, I'm not sure, but maybe some things would be grandfathered in whereas other projects that are in the middle of cleanup, we may have to go back. I'm not sure.

MR. VEZNER: There's really no way to know what Superfund will look like after the reauthorizing and how long it will be before reauthorization actually follows through. Some laws have been through reauthorization for a very long time, you know, and there's no end in site to that, you know, so it's really hard to say how long it will take, what the law will say when it's done. We really have no way to know.

MS. BILL: I would like to invite people during the comment period, if you would like to make some suggestions for additional alternatives or additional technology that we haven't looked at, just please send us a note by March 31st and we'll take a look.

More questions?

FR. BODZIONY: Father Bodziony, B-O-D-Z-I-O-N-Y. What happens if somebody has a high level in their blood and there doesn't seem to be any answer in their house or anything like that? Is there something in this fund that would assist people like that?

MS. BILL: In terms of Superfund, no. We do not pay for health types of issues.

FR. BODZIONY: They say that stays in your blood forever, you know.

MS. BILL: No. Not under the Superfund there is not.

MR. SPURLOCH: Warren Spurloch. I live on Holmden Avenue. When they come in and excavated the dirt, they didn't notify anybody really interested in the run-off from previous years, how long the stuff had been dumped there. They only come in and excavated the top part of the hill and that is a very steep hill.

MR. HEATH: What was your question, sir?

MR. SPURLOCH: When they come in and excavated to remove the soil on Holmden Hill, they brought the gigantic machine with the reach of 35, 40 feet and that's all they did. How about the bottom of the hill with all the run-off water and stuff? I'm sure there are sewers down there.

MR. HEATH: I know they sampled on the site both before and after. I would have to go back and look to see what kind of sampling was done down there.

MR. RAY: During the very early stages when they did the sampling, they did sample down the hill and they were able to actually delineate the slope of the bank. They actually had sampled some on LTV property. Now, obviously, the contamination that was found on top of the hill was easily attributed to the Master Metals' site when they had dumped soil on that property in years past. But the contamination at the lower end, was this from Master Metals, was this from previous fill opportunities or was it from a contribution from LTV?

Now, those numbers, let me say that the numbers that they found down the hill were lower than they were up the hill and, also, you're getting into a real safety factor. I mean, obviously the hill is very steep. There's really no way to get a machine halfway down the hill to remove soil.

MR. SPURLOCH: What about starting from the bottom and come up the hill?

MR. RAY: The numbers showed there wasn't a need to go down the hill. The numbers down the slope decreased and the area that remains that was not excavated are below the standards that were established for the site.

MS. ABRAHAM: They marked the property off and they sampled each grade and kept going down. Where they finally stopped was when the contamination was below residential standard. It coincided with the parts where it started to get harder down the slope and we were grateful for that because we didn't want a dead consultant on our hands.

MR. SPURLOCH: Lead is lead regardless of what the PPM is. I worked in a hazardous waste treatment plant for three and a half years. I dealt with all kinds of stuff, too. I know the effect it will have on you. There's no fence up there. Nothing. I mean, where they excavated, they even made it steeper. Some small child gets over there and starts over that hill, you'll have a hazard on your hands. You can have a fatality.

MS. ABRAHAM: I would certainly agree. My answer to you would be, as a health professional, I would say that there is minimal risk from lead left on the Holmden Avenue property because that risk -- the lead levels that we have found remaining there really do not pose a threat based on all the data that we have. I would certainly agree there's also a slip, trip and fall hazard. If my family lived there, I would be more concerned with my child rolling down the hill. That would be a problem.

MR. SPURLOCH: What can be done about that?

MR. VEZNER: One possibility might be maybe you speak to the land owners there. We don't have the right to regulate what somebody does with their property in that sense.

MR. SPURLOCH: Well, from the owner's property there, they cut down four foot behind their fence. Now their back yards are slipping over to where they excavated from. I mean, they put a real big driveway, I call it, there four foot behind some of the properties on there. You can drive around to where they excavated. There's no barriers up. There's nothing.

MR. RAY: I can tell you that the excavation that took place behind the property, there was agreements made with those property owners to go onto their property and conduct those activities. We can request -- I don't know how, regulatory, if regulation allows us to direct those. We can ask the PRPs to address those concerns, but just due to the nature of our jobs for protection environmentally, we were worried about certain exposures to certain chemicals and things like that.

We can't force them to do anything. We certainly can address it and ask them if they can help out in those concerns.

MR. SPURLOCH: Thank you.

MS. BILL: Spell your last name.

MR. SPURLOCH: S-P-U-R-L-O-C-H. Warren, W-A-R-R-E-N.

MS. OGLE: Donna Ogle. I own property on Holmden Hill. I want to know when was the last time you tested the property for the lead? When was the last time?

MS. ABRAHAM: Last year, 1998, when the remedial action was completed. I'm sorry. I can get you the date if you give me a couple minutes.

MR. RAY: It's probably going to be around the latter part of '97 or early '98, and that's when they did the confirmation samples that they had removed lead down to the residential standard and then clean soil, which was also tested, was brought in and placed on top of the excavated area.

MS. ABRAHAM: December 1997.

MS. OGLE: Are you going to test it again?

MS. ABRAHAM: No, ma'am. Once they -- once it was tested and it was reseeded, then there was no necessity in our minds because there was no source of lead.

MS. OGLE: Well, in the first place, this project was supposed to be seven to nine months and we were to believe that the EPA had us leave our home and they said it would be seven to nine months and in October it's going to be seven years. Three years ago vandals burned my house down. We lost everything, the property, we lost everything we had. No help from the EPA, no one contacted us to tell us anything, what they were doing, and now we're just starting to get a little bit from the state.

Kucinich was notified of this, Mary Rose Oakar was notified of this. Nothing was done. There were barriers put up, railroad ties put in. Guys tore it up. Where we had a fence put up, they tore it down. Now I want to know what else can be done? This is seven years and we lost everything, including my granddaughter and all of us had lead poisoning, but it was coming through the air. It was airborne from the contamination of the lead from the dirt.

MS. BILL: What specifically would you be looking for at this point? I'm sorry.

MS. OGLE: The dirt from the run-around, they don't know what they're talking about.

MR. ERTL: John Ertle, E-R-T-L-E. These test results have never been given to the Ogles. The last they knew, the site was far in excess of the residential standard and didn't even meet the industrial standards, and I guess we would like to know why the homes on Holmden Avenue property are not part of the site as defined under Superfund. And the answer to that I'm hearing is that there are some test results that indicate that the levels are appropriate. Is that what you're saying?

MR. RAY: As of the first phase or the state uses the term "emergency removal," but the first removal phase of this project where they actually did go in and remove the contaminated soil, tests confirmed that levels -- they had reached levels of containment and brought some soil in to put back on the soil and reseeded it.

Those numbers are available both in our office and through U.S. EPA through public records access. If I may, I can -- you know, Mr. and Mrs. Ogle's story is a tragic story and the agency at the time was working with Master Metals corporation to address that situation. There was actually an agreement between Ohio EPA and Master Metals to remove the contaminated soil from that property.

To briefly summarize, Master Metals had sent some material off site that made its way just up the hill to Ogles' property and was dumped on their property. Ohio EPA found out about it, went and worked with Master Metals not in a cooperative fashion. The Ohio EPA mandated that Master Metals remove that source of contamination and they started to do that, and in 1992, some soils were removed.

In the meantime, Master Metals was closed by our agency due to the air emissions that was coming off through the work at the City of Cleveland air pollution control. That basically caused the whole legal snafu. Master Metals, claiming they had no more money to do anything, Ohio EPA insisted they continue to do that. Basically just through the legal system and through Master Metals' claims of not having enough funds to continue that, that site remained in limbo, and may I say tragically so.

The Ohio EPA and U.S. EPA, when this potential responsible party, this group of employers, was put -- or group of industries was put together to address Master Metals, they didn't want to look at the Holmden Avenue property. U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA insisted, you're going to go down here to this Master Metals facility and maybe spend millions of dollars. We need you to address this facility, as well, because even though these companies sent waste to Master Metals, they had nothing to do with the fact that Master Metals sent contaminated soil to these folks' property.

But just through their cooperation and their agreement, they agreed to address and actually have paid for the work that was done up there through this removal act.

MR. ERTL: Who is "they"?

MR. RAY: This potential responsible party group, this industry group that the agencies are working with in the Master Metals project. Their contractor did that work through an agreement that the plan was agreed upon with the agencies to do that work, and those numbers were established in that agreement to what the levels of cleanup would be. It's the agency's prospective now that those numbers are protective and that those numbers have been met and that's a clean site.

We hear today that there's concerns about some physical dangers that remain there. We

can only tell you that we can ask to have those addressed. We can't guarantee that anything like that will be done, but I don't mean to take up time, but, in a nutshell, that sort of is how this whole tragic situation has ended up where we're at now.

MS. BILL: I assume the state has the best set of data as to the samples taken on the property. Could you provide a set?

MS. ABRAHAM: It's in the Holmden Avenue report.

MR. RAY: We have it and if you folks want to get a card from me afterwards, the whole process of doing up a file review, if you're after something specific, we can copy it and send it to you in the mail. If you're after a whole board history, we have to ask you to set up a file review and come in and look at all the information.

MS. OGLE: Why didn't you people let us know what was going on step by step? Why is it we have to wait all these years, sit and wait to go back home and there's no home to go back to. EPA had us move out and we're still out, no home, no nothing. But then you collected your fines and everything from Master Metals. You collected everything from Master Metals. You fined them. You give them this 30 days extension, 90 days extension. You got your money from them.

MR. RAY: Actually, Master Metals did not pay their fines that they owed the agencies.

MS. OGLE: Didn't you just say a little while ago --

MR. RAY: Master Metals was actually included. It's a part of that 120 companies, but they didn't spend, to my knowledge, haven't contributed at all to the cleanup. It's been other industries that sent materials to Master Metals. Master Metals itself did not sign on to this order that was put together to help clean up your property and the site down in the valley.

They had other companies come in and clean it up and they never were paid either. There's a long line of people waiting to get their money from Master Metals, so you're right. And because of --

MS. OGLE: What's going to happen now?

MR. RAY: Because of those financial constraints, that was their argument to us. We cannot do anything. Ohio doesn't have like U.S. EPA does where Ohio can extend moneys to do the cleanups. It's not in the Ohio statutes. We can -- we have abilities maybe on a limited basis.

If a truck rolls over on the highway, Ohio EPA can make some emergency demands. But as far as extensive, Ohio EPA doesn't have those programs, and because of a whole legal issue in the permits that Master Metals held and their status with both Ohio EPA and U.S. EPA, they couldn't expend those moneys until Master Metals relinquished the certain permits, because if they did not, then U.S. EPA would have cleaned up the site and Master Metals would have had an active permit to go back in there and conduct business again.

U.S. EPA waited until Master Metals gave up the permits before they could get involved and do their removal that was done in the last couple of years.

MS. BILL: I think we need to move on. This is a terrible situation and I know we have talked to you about this before. I don't think any of us were involved at the time and can't explain why you didn't get the kind of communication that you should have and that you deserved. We can just commit at this point to give you the information we have and try to work with you on some of the issues that remain.

Just for anyone who doesn't know, the owner of Master Metals has since passed on. There is nobody really to tie in who's responsible directly for this except what we said, the PRPs. So it's unfortunate there isn't anybody who did this dumping and things like that in the past. This person is gone, but again, like what we're trying to do with the EPA here is try and take care of some of the problems that were left behind from this company.

THE AUDIENCE: But we would appreciate a much cleaner environment in the Tremont neighborhood there.

MS. SPURLOCH: Verna Spurloch. I wanted to know with all the literature -- she said she had lead poisoning, her family. Is there a long-term illness to come on further people that lives on Holmden Avenue because I live there? I have grandchildren and I want to know this.

MS. BILL: So your question is about long-term health effects from lead?

MS. SPURLOCH: Right. Is it going to stay in the system? I seen a child with lead poisoning at the age of three years old and it was terrible and I don't want to see my grandchildren go through that, and I want to know if there's some kind of indication that this is going to happen, or is the lead poisoning going to come back on this hill? Is there some way of telling me yes or no?

MS. ABRAHAM: It would depend on -- have you had your grandchildren tested?

MS. SPURLOCH: My grandchild is a year old. My other one just born, not even a month old.

MS. ABRAHAM: It would depend on the levels of lead in your daughter's or your son's -- well, your daughter's blood. If these are your children by -- grandchildren by your daughter, then -- and if your daughter was exposed to lead and she continued to be exposed to lead, she carried that in her bloodstream and fastened it to the baby. That could be an issue. It depends on how much lead she had in her body.

So what you would need to do officially is to get that tested, and that's why, you know, you can certainly call our office. I suggest the Cleveland Health Department, the Ohio Department of Health. We can talk to you after the meeting, give you numbers, contacts. I would personally work with you. I have a lot of information on lead.

MS. WHITLOW: The City of Cleveland Health Department would be very glad to send you -- we have pamphlets and packets of information we send the folks who have any interest in this. If you want to write down the number, I can give it to you now. We're in the phonebook. It's 664-2175 and you just call and tell them you're interested in receiving a pamphlet of lead information, and if you want to talk to any of the staff or talk to folks about it, you're more than welcome to call our office and somebody will talk to you about it.

MS. ABRAHAM: Ma'am, the other thing to remember is that the lead that your daughter or you, anybody could have been exposed to doesn't only come from Master Metals. It comes from the paint you have. It comes from the automobile exhaust, so you have to understand, it comes from the plumbing. You need to be aware of everything that is going towards getting the lead you have.

MS. WHITLOW: Colleen in our office has the local lead education. They have had other screenings at Merrick House. There's a health fair here at Pilgrim, so we'll get you stuff that is already set up.

MS. BILL: The colored pamphlets are up on the table. Pick those up when

you leave as well as a business card.

MR. ROSS: Terry Ross. I'm from the Department of Community Development from the City. I have a couple process questions. From the time the comment period ends to the time that the plan is selected, how much time is that, and then, also, will the plan be announced to the public, and, thirdly, will there be any opportunity for any type of public input between the time the plan is selected and --

MS. BILL: I'll try to answer your second question. In terms of once EPA has made a final decision, we will be announcing that to the public. We're required by law to place an ad in the paper. We'll send out a fax sheet, especially as it gets time for construction. We often frequently hold open houses or public meetings and, you know, I would be interested in how you would like to be informed or be kept informed as we do the cleanup.

MR. ROSS: Will there be any point where the public can have input once the plan is selected but before the consent order is issued?

MS. BILL: You mean in terms of?

MR. ROSS: What alternative is chosen. Will there be any additional public comment period?

MS. BILL: Not in terms of a public hearing like tonight. That's what tonight is for, for us to hear your comments on the alternative that you're proposing.

MR. ROSS: Even if we could provide some type of input, writing or calling or whatever?

MR. HEATH: Right now there's no legal requirement that would go back out for public comment after we make that decision, but depending on the comments we get, you know, if there's a lot of concern about the alternative or selecting another alternative that may allow some kind of development that may not be -- the neighborhood may not like, I think it would be prudent on our part to go back out. You know, I would support that.

And I'll probably be handing over the case to Gwen at that point. If there's a lot of concern in the comments we get now about changing the selected plan, we have to evaluate what that is all about. I think we would go out and do it. If people are concerned, you know, have other concerns that don't really affect, that we feel aren't pertinent to what we finally select, we may not do that. There's no legal requirement for that.

MS. BILL: Then if there's significant changes to what we're talking about tonight, we will go back out and as the time comes toward doing construction, we'll have a meeting for people to find out things about truck traffic and that sort of thing.

You said you had another question.

MR. ROSS: That was it.

MR. NAGY: My name is Scott Nagy. I have a question about the site itself. How much of the surface area will be under the cap, whether it be the clay cap or the asphalt? How much of the surface area of the site itself?

MR. HEATH: I think about 90 percent of the fenced in area is concrete and of that concreted area, somewhere between 70 to 80 percent of that will probably be covered with the cap. So for the total site, anywhere from 60 to 70 percent. I think they have to run tests on the concrete that's out there to decide is this structurally sound, that it's not going to crack up in the next year or two, and that will all come in the design phase of the project.

Once we select it, they go out and test it, and we'll try to minimize that as much as possible so that it is, you know, in a more usable state and it will provide cost savings. Instead of

putting a clay cap, if it's structurally sound concrete, there's no reason to cover it up.

MS. BILL: Spell your last name for us.

MR. NAGY: N-A-G-Y.

MS. BILL: It's nine o'clock. What I would like to do is put a hold on the question and answer and proceed now into the comment period. We've had about nine people who have expressed an interest in making a public comment, so what I would like to do is -- ten people -- is take these ten comments, finish that up and we can go back to question and answer. Would that be okay with everybody?

As I mentioned, with the comment period, I'll call your name if you filled out a card. If you're interested in making a comment and you haven't filled out a card, please go ahead and do so. We won't be responding to comments tonight, but we will be responding in writing in about a month or so.

Donna, do you want to say anything more?

MS. OGLE: No.

MS. BILL: Next person who wanted to express a comment, Paul Quayle.

MR. QUAYLE: Yes. My name is Paul Quayle, Q-U-A-Y-L-E, Midwest Railway Historical Foundation, the over-the-fence neighbor of this site. As Ralph mentioned, we sort of watch it virtually every day. We're very encouraged that the cleanup has gone as far as it has. We have been a neighbor of this thing since the early '80s, back in the really bad days when it was belching and doing all kinds of unmentionables over there.

We're very encouraged to see that this property is headed towards a resolution of it. Our organization is a volunteer organization. It owns, restores and appraises historic railroad equipment. This site has in one corner of it a very historical significant roundhouse building and we are -- in part of the roundhouse building, there's just a block wall that separates us and we hope that eventually when all this is resolved, that this area can be turned into a railroad museum for the City of Cleveland and the Tremont neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. BILL: Thank you. Carol, did you want to make a comment?

MS. SMITH: I did not want to; no.

MS. BILL: Kyle?

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: I guess I'll just -- Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells. I think the chosen alternative is the one to go with. I think there's two weaknesses and I would like to see a plan for actually addressing those in the future. One is the maintenance. It's not sufficient currently and I think that there's enough interest in this neighborhood that we could detail something.

And the second is the future use. I understand the regulatory scheme that we all are working under, but I think there's also interest in the neighborhood to help actually figure out a logical cleanup and a logical future use. That's my comment.

MS. BILL: Okay. Thank you. Laura Kleiman, K-L-E-I-N-M-A-N.

MS. KLEINMAN: I'd just like to strongly, strongly encourage when we're done with this meeting tonight, basically -- unless there's some significant change in the plan, that's what will happen. There will be some continued conversation and we'll hear about the final proposal.

I would like to strongly encourage -- it's obvious that economic development from the City is here and community development and various other departments are very interested in what's going to happen to the site, and I would like to strongly encourage the continued

communication between those representatives and U.S. EPA and the State of Ohio EPA as it's pertinent, because I imagine it will be through those representatives that we find out exactly what's going to be happening on a daily, weekly basis until that final decision is made.

MS. BILL: Okay. Thank you. Emily, you're next. Would you like to make a comment?

MS. LIPOVAN: No. I already made mine.

MS. DREYFUSS-WELLS: Can you stress it's not on the public record unless folks -- this is different. This is -- you have to formally respond to this as opposed to the questions; right?

MS. BILL: Yeah. Let me explain again. This whole meeting from start to finish, there is going to be a transcript. It's all in the public record. The difference between the question and answer period and comment period is that we don't respond in writing to questions. We only respond in writing to comments that are made right now.

Merle.

MS. GORDON: I would like to comment and suggest that we look at alternative, what I suggest as an alternative number 5 where you do actually remediate the soil and leave it as a grass and clay cover and then a grass top. You have an opportunity to go after 50 companies which, if you look through this list, an extra \$50,000 is a drop in the bucket to them. The additional cost could easily be covered by these companies, so I would encourage that you remediate it to the extent that you possibly can clean the soil and leave it as a grass cap. Thank you.

MS. BILL: The last person who wanted to make a comment was Joe Cimperman.

MR. CIMPERMAN: The only comment I would like to make is that I would like to ask the EPA to look at the PRP list again in terms of soliciting more funds for the complete and total cleanup of this site. I know that the community would support you in pursuing the added revenue that it would take to make sure that the dirt was completely clean and that we weren't refilling it with bad stuff.

The other comment I would like to make is to take the offer and put it on the table that there would be monthly reports to the block club over this period of 30 years that you are doing this, whichever lasts longer, to ensure that their reporting continually occur. If I could ask that, it would be the Director of Public Health for the City of Cleveland. Thank you.

MS. BILL: I apologize. This is kind of bureaucratic.

THE AUDIENCE: The Superfund 800 number that was on that film, can we call? Let's not say in the middle of the night tomorrow, but if we think of another question later after this meeting, can we call that 800 number?

MS. BILL: I don't know what that 800 number was. I suspect that was Washington. Let me give you the 800 number for region five. It's 1-800-621-8431, and I have a lot of business cards with that number on it. You can call me through that number, Jeff Heath, Kris Vezner or Gwen Massenburg.

With that, we'll end the meeting. We'll hang out for awhile if you want to talk to us about the individual situations.

- - -

(Thereupon the meeting was concluded at 9:10 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Denise C. Winter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete transcript of my stenotypy notes which were taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified.

I do further certify that I am not a relative, counsel or attorney of either party or otherwise interested in the event of this action.

Denise C. Winter
Notary Public

My Commission expires March 3, 2001.